Spectral properties of reduced fermionic density operators and parity superselection rule

Grigori G. Amosov[1] and Sergey N. Filippov[2, 3, 4]

[1] *V. A. Steklov Mathematical Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Gubkina Str. 8, Moscow, 119991, Russia*
[2] *Institute of Physics and Technology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Nakhimovskii Pr. 34, Moscow 117218, Russia*
[3] *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institutskii Per. 9, Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region 141700, Russia*
[4] *P. N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Leninskii Pr. 53, Moscow 119991, Russia*

We consider pure fermionic states with varying number of quasiparticles and demonstrate that spectra of partial states (reduced with respect to some bipartition) are not identical as it takes place for bosons and conventional states in spaces with tensor product structure. We fully characterize pure states with equispectral partial states and show that they are related via local unitary operations with states satisfying the parity superselection rule. Thus, valid purifications for fermionic density operators are found. As a byproduct, the positive semidefinite density matrix for fermions is constructed without implying the state gaussianity. The developed formalism clearly indicates that the conventional partial trace methods are not applicable to fermionic systems.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Aa, 03.65.Fd, 03.67.Bg, 05.30.Fk

arXiv:1512.01828v1 [quant-ph] 6 Dec 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The physical nature of information [1] not only provides the new ways of information processing (like quantum computing [2]) but also stimulates the research of specific information carriers — particles and quasiparticles with peculiar properties. This paper deals with particular quantum states which represent a superposition of states with varying number of fermionic quasiparticles.

After electrons were argued to possess the additional degree of freedom [3] (later called spin [4]) and obey the Pauli exclusion principle [5], the Fermi–Dirac statistics was found [6, 7] and the general notion of fermion particles emerged. Antisymmetric nature of fermionic wavefunction [7] has provoked development of the canonical anticommutation relation [8] and the general theory of second quantization [9], which deals with systems with varying number of particles. The fermionic statistics of half-integer spin particles was established in [10, 11]. Since every fermion owns a half-integer spin, the total spin of an even number of fermions must be even, whereas that of an odd number of fermions must be odd. Given a system with varying number of particles, it is therefore possible to have a superposition of half-integer and integer total spins. However, it was recognized later that the comparison of phases between states with half-integer and integer angular momenta cannot be reconciled with the requirement of relativistic invariance [12], which resulted in the formulation of parity (spinor, univalence) superselection rule (see, e.g., the reviews [13–15]). Any superselection rule relies on a group of physical transformations, for example the parity superselection relies on the rotational invariance [16] whereas the mass superselection rule relies on the Galilean invariance of non-relativistic quantum mechanics [17]. If a system of leptons were invariant with respect to fermionic $U(1)$ transformations, there would be a leptonic family number superselection rule, however, the recent experiments clearly indicate the neutrino oscillations (see, e.g., [18]), which contradicts to the conservation of leptonic family number (the violation was predicted in Ref. [19]). Thus, the experimental investigations of nature modify our understanding of fundamental symmetries, the physical models, and the mathematical frameworks used for their description. Recent experiments with massless Weyl fermionic quasiparticles [20–22] stimulate us to investigate properties of fermionic states in coherent superpositions of different number states.

In this paper, we analyze properties of general pure fermionic states with a varying number of quasiparticles from the viewpoint of quantum information theory, namely, we consider the spectra of two reduced density operators obtained from such a state by some bipartition. The inverse procedure is known as a purification and takes a simple form in tensor product spaces because the two spectra are identical (an immediate consequence of the Schmidt decomposition). We demonstrate that spectra do not necessarily coincide for a general fermionic state, which can be interpreted as a violation [23] of the Araki–Lieb inequality [24]. It reveals the incorrectness of some results exploiting the coincidence of spectra, e.g., the quantification of a pure state entanglement via the entropy of one of subsystems [25]. The discrepancy between spectra (entropies) of subsystems of a pure state seems to be unphysical (since the result depends on labelling), so we further find necessary and sufficient conditions for spectra to be coincident. In particular, we not only find that spectra coincide for states satisfying the parity superselection rule [26] but also prove that all states with equispectral subsystems are the univalent states subjected to local unitary transformations. Thus, we extend our analysis to consider general fermionic states that potentially violate the parity superselection rule, e.g., in noninertial frames [27–29]. The aim of the paper is to fully characterize states with coincident spectra of reduced states.

As a byproduct, we formalize the density matrix construction for states with varying number of fermions. Our description of fermionic density operator differs from that used by Cahill and Glauber [30]. In fact, the density operator formalism developed in quantum chemistry considers a fixed number of particles in the system and the reduction is performed by integrating over some particles' coordinates [31–33], which results in the so-called p-particle reduced density matrix (see, e.g., [34]). Such an approach provides new inequalities for fermionic occupation numbers and leads to the generalized Pauli constraints [35–38]. In our approach, however, we deal with states with

coherent superpositions of different number of particles, so we exploit the bipartition based not on the particles but rather on fermionic modes. Fermionic modes can be thought of as nodes that can be either occupied or not by particles. The bipartition is merely an aggregation of all nodes into two groups. Mathematically, we deal with the algebraic bipartition in the second quantized description [39–43], which is used in the study of entanglement [44–47].

The problem of our interest — possible pure fermionic states with equispectral reduced density operators — is connected with the problem of calculating von Neumann entropy for the fermionic dynamical systems and estimating capacities of fermionic quantum channels [48, 49]. One may expect that the transfer of quantum information through a fermionic channel would be different from that for bosons [50], as the fermionic theory differs from the qubit theory [51, 52] both in tomography [53] and quantum computation [54].

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we describe the notation used and formulate the problem. In Sec. III, the density matrix formalism is concisely clarified. In Sec. IV, the main results regarding the spectra of reduced states are obtained. In Sec. V, brief conclusions are given.

II. NOTATION

Consider the algebra of canonical anticommutation relations (CAR algebra) $\mathcal{A}$ generated by the ladder operators $a_k, a_k^\dagger$ satisfying the relations [8, 55]

$$a_k a_s^\dagger + a_s^\dagger a_k = \delta_{ks} I,$$
$$a_k a_s + a_s a_k = a_k^\dagger a_s^\dagger + a_s^\dagger a_k^\dagger = 0,$$

where $k, s = 1, \ldots, n$. Let H_n be the Hilbert space with the dimension $\dim H_n = 2^n$ and $\{|j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle\}$ be the fixed orthonormal basis, where indices $j_s = 0, 1$. We shall suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is realized as the algebra of all bounded operators in H_n such that

$$a_k^\dagger |j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\sum_{s=1}^{k-1} j_s} |j_1 \ldots j_{k-1}\, 1\, j_{k+1} \ldots j_n\rangle & \text{if} \quad j_k = 0, \\ 0 \quad \text{if} \quad j_k = 1, \end{cases}$$

and a_k is conjugate to $a_k^\dagger$.

A positive functional $\omega \in B(H_n)^*$ normed by the condition $\omega(I) = 1$ is called a state on the algebra of all bounded operators $B(H_n)$ in H_n. Given a state ω, there exists a unique positive unit-trace operator ρ such that $\omega(x) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho x)$, $x \in B(H_n)$. *A spectrum of* ω is defined as the spectrum of ρ. The following definition [44] will play a major role in our analysis:

Definition 1. The state $|\psi\rangle$ satisfies the parity superselection rule if a unit vector $|\psi\rangle \in H$ has the form

$$\psi = \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \{0,1\}} \lambda_{j_1 \ldots j_n} |j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle, \ \lambda_{j_1 \ldots j_n} \in \mathbb{C}, \qquad (1)$$

where all the numbers $\sum_k j_k$ are even or odd alternatively for all non-zero $\lambda_{j_1 \ldots j_n}$.

The set of all states satisfying the superselection rule contains the important subset consisting of pure states for which the number of particles N is fixed. If this is the case, non-zero terms in (1) satisfy the condition $\sum_k j_k = N = \text{const}$. It is worth mentioning that all pure quasifree fermionic states have a fixed number of particles [56, 57].

Another important class of fermionic states is determined by their peculiar action on monomials of the odd order:

Definition 2. The state ω is said to be even if

$$\omega(a_{j_1}^\# \ldots a_{j_{2k+1}}^\#) = 0$$

for any choice of ladder operators $a_s^\# = a_s$ or $a_s^\dagger$, $s = 1, \ldots, 2k+1$.

The relation between the above classes becomes especially clear in the case of pure states.

Proposition 1. *The pure state ω is even iff it satisfies the parity superselection rule.*

Proof. Suppose that ω satisfies the parity superselection rule. Consider the representation (1). Since the odd order monomial $a_{j_1}^\# \ldots a_{j_{2k+1}}^\#$ changes even number of particles to the odd one and vice versa, the vectors $a_{j_1}^\# \ldots a_{j_{2k+1}}^\# |j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle$ corresponding to non-zero terms in (1) are pairwise orthogonal for any choice of $a_s^\#$. It follows that ω is even.

If ω does not satisfy the parity superselection rule, then its representation in the form of (1) contains at least two non-zero terms, say $|j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle$ and $|\tilde{j}_1 \ldots \tilde{j}_n\rangle$, such that $\sum_k j_k$ and $\sum_k \tilde{j}_k$ have different parity. There exists the unique monomial of odd order $a_{k_1} \ldots a_{k_{2s+1}}$, which is a partial isometrical operator mapping $|j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle$ to $|\tilde{j}_1 \ldots \tilde{j}_n\rangle$ and reset to zero all the other basis vectors. Thus, the value of ω does not equal zero on this monomial. Hence, ω can not be even. □

Now we need to introduce partitions of the system. Since we analyze systems with varying number of quasiparticles, the partition is performed among modes that fermions can potentially occupy, for example, nodes of some lattice potential.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be obtained by joining two algebras of canonical anticommutation relations $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ with the generators $\{a_1, a_1^\dagger, \ldots, a_m, a_m^\dagger\}$ and $\{a_{m+1}, a_{m+1}^\dagger, \ldots, a_n, a_n^\dagger\}$, respectively. Fix a unit vector $|\psi\rangle \in H$.

Definition 3. The states $\omega_j(x) = \langle\psi|x|\psi\rangle$, $x \in \mathcal{A}_j$ that are the restrictions of a pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ to the algebras $\mathcal{A}_j$, $j = 1, 2$, are said to be reduced (partial) states of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

Quantification of entanglement in Ref. [25] relies on the assumption that the spectra of partial fermionic states are the same as it takes place in the bosonic case. In Sec. IV, we show that this assumption is not valid. Our problem is to characterize all the states that have equispectral reduced states. Such a characterization will be based on states satisfying the parity superselection rule.

Before we proceed to the solution of the problem, we construct the density matrix of total and partial fermionic states in the convenient form.

III. DENSITY MATRIX FOR FERMIONS

Let us consider n fermionic modes and the corresponding CAR algebra $\mathcal{A}$, $\dim\mathcal{A} = 4^n$. The generators of $\mathcal{A}$ are $a_s a_s^\dagger$, a_s, $a_s^\dagger$, and $a_s^\dagger a_s$, $s = 1, \ldots, n$. Binary representation of numbers $0, \ldots, 2^n - 1$ forms the set of multiindices $\mathcal{J} \ni J = (j_1, \ldots, j_n)$, $j_s \in \{0, 1\}$. Given two multiindices $J, K \in \mathcal{J}$, let us define $A_{JK} \in \mathcal{A}$ by the formula

$$A_{JK} = c_{j_1}^\dagger c_{j_2}^\dagger \ldots c_{j_n}^\dagger c_{k_n} \ldots c_{k_2} c_{k_1}, \tag{2}$$

where

$$c_{j_s}^\dagger = \begin{cases} a_s a_s^\dagger & \text{if} \quad j_s = 0, \\ a_s^\dagger & \text{if} \quad j_s = 1; \end{cases} \qquad c_{k_s} = \begin{cases} a_s a_s^\dagger & \text{if} \quad k_s = 0, \\ a_s & \text{if} \quad k_s = 1. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2. *The following relation holds:*

$$A_{JK} = |j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle\langle k_1 \ldots k_n|.$$

Proof. Consider the operator $C_K = c_{k_n} \ldots c_{k_1}$, which is a rank one partial isometry in the sense that $C_K = |\varphi\rangle\langle\chi|$ for some unit vectors $|\varphi\rangle, |\chi\rangle \in H$ that are either orthogonal or coincide. Moreover, $C_K|k_1 \ldots k_n\rangle = |0 \ldots 0\rangle$. Then, $A_{JK} = C_J^\dagger C_K$, which concludes the proof. □

The construction similar to that in Eq. (2) was used in the paper [58] for other purposes.

Corollary 1. *The element $\rho \in \mathcal{A}$ defines a valid quantum state iff it can be represented in the form*

$$\rho = \sum_{J,K \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_{JK} A_{JK}, \tag{3}$$

where (λ_{JK}) is a positive semidefinite matrix with the unit trace $\sum_J \lambda_{JJ} = 1$ (fermionic density matrix).

Proof. Any element of the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ can be represented in the form (3) because (A_{JK}) are matrix units due to Proposition 2. The functional $\omega(x) = \sum_{J,K \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_{JK} \mathrm{Tr}(A_{JK} x)$ gives non-negative values for positive semidefinite operators x if and only if (λ_{JK}) is a positive semidefinite matrix too (as the functional is a trace of the product of two matrices). Finally, $\omega(I) = \sum_J \lambda_{JJ} = 1$. □

The $2^n \times 2^n$ matrix (λ_{JK}) is a fermionic density matrix and fulfils the conventional requirements (Hermitian, positive semidefinite, and unit trace). The following Corollary provides a convenient description of the density operator.

Corollary 2. *The $2^n \times 2^n$ matrix with elements $\langle A_{KJ}\rangle$ is a density matrix of an n-mode fermionic state over which the average is taken.*

Proof. In fact, $\langle A_{KJ}\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(A_{JK}^\dagger \rho) = \lambda_{JK}$. □

Example 1. Using Eq. (2) and Corollary 2, the 2-mode fermionic state can be described by the (total) density matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \langle a_1 a_1^\dagger a_2 a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_1 a_1^\dagger a_2\rangle & \langle a_1 a_2 a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_2 a_1\rangle \\ \langle a_1 a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_1 a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger a_2\rangle & \langle a_2^\dagger a_1\rangle & \langle a_1 a_2^\dagger a_2\rangle \\ \langle a_1^\dagger a_2 a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_1^\dagger a_2\rangle & \langle a_1^\dagger a_1 a_2 a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_1^\dagger a_2 a_1\rangle \\ \langle a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger a_2\rangle & \langle a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger a_1\rangle & \langle a_1^\dagger a_1 a_2^\dagger a_2\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

which is constructed with the help of the conventional set of multiindices $\mathcal{J} = \{(0,0); (0,1); (1,0); (1,1)\}$ and differs from symbols used to describe fermionic Gaussian states [59] (reviewed, e.g., in [60]). The reduced (partial) density matrices of the first and the second mode read

$$\begin{pmatrix} \langle a_1 a_1^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_1\rangle \\ \langle a_1^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_1^\dagger a_1\rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \langle a_2 a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_2\rangle \\ \langle a_2^\dagger\rangle & \langle a_2^\dagger a_2\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

respectively. Note that both matrices (5) cannot be simultaneously obtained from the total density matrix (4) by conventional partial trace methods. This is a peculiar property of fermionic states which differs them from the bosonic ones.

IV. SPECTRA OF REDUCED STATES

To anticipate general results, let us begin with the simplest case of two fermionic modes that can be occupied by a system with a varying number of quasiparticles in a pure state $|\psi\rangle = c_{00}|00\rangle + c_{01}|01\rangle + c_{10}|10\rangle + c_{11}|11\rangle$. According to Example 1 the total density matrix (4) for such a state is $(c_{00}, c_{01}, c_{10}, c_{11})^\top (\overline{c_{00}}, \overline{c_{01}}, \overline{c_{10}}, \overline{c_{11}})$ and corresponds to the pure state indeed, whereas the reduced density matrices (5) take the form

$$\Lambda_1 = \begin{pmatrix} |c_{00}|^2 + |c_{01}|^2 & \overline{c_{00}} c_{10} + \overline{c_{01}} c_{11} \\ c_{00}\overline{c_{10}} + c_{01}\overline{c_{11}} & |c_{10}|^2 + |c_{11}|^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and}$$
$$\Lambda_2 = \begin{pmatrix} |c_{00}|^2 + |c_{10}|^2 & \overline{c_{00}} c_{01} - \overline{c_{10}} c_{11} \\ c_{00}\overline{c_{01}} - c_{10}\overline{c_{11}} & |c_{01}|^2 + |c_{11}|^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively. The spectra of Λ_1 and Λ_2 would be identical if and only if $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_1) = \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_2)$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_1^2) = \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_2^2)$. The first condition always holds true whereas the second one reduces to $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_1^2 - \Lambda_2^2) = 8\mathrm{Re}(c_{00} c_{11} \overline{c_{01} c_{10}}) = 0$. This observation can be summarized as follows.

Proposition 3. *The two-mode fermionic state $|\psi\rangle = c_{00}|00\rangle + c_{01}|01\rangle + c_{10}|10\rangle + c_{11}|11\rangle$ has equispectral reduced density operators if and only if $\mathrm{Re}(c_{00} c_{11} \overline{c_{01} c_{10}}) = 0$.*

Example 2. Suppose $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle)$, then $\mathrm{Spect}(\omega_1) = \{0, 1\}$ whereas $\mathrm{Spect}(\omega_2) = \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that a pure state ω satisfies the parity superselection rule. Then, the spectra of ω_1 and ω_2 coincide.*

Proof. Let us define an isometry $U : H_n \to H_m \otimes H_{n-m}$ by the formula

$$U|j_1 \ldots j_n\rangle = |j_1 \ldots j_m\rangle \otimes |j_{m+1} \ldots j_n\rangle. \tag{6}$$

Then

$$U a_s^\# U^\dagger = \begin{cases} a_s^{(1)\#} \otimes I & \text{if} \quad s = 1, \ldots, m, \\ \Gamma \otimes a_s^{(2)\#} & \text{if} \quad s = m+1, \ldots, n, \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

where the fermionic operators $a_s^{(1)\#}$ and $a_s^{(2)\#}$ act on Hilbert spaces H_m and H_{n-m}, respectively, and $\Gamma = \prod_{s=1}^m (a_s^{(1)} a_s^{(1)\dagger} - a_s^{(1)\dagger} a_s^{(1)})$.

Consider the pure state $\Omega(X) = \omega(U^\dagger X U)$, $X \in B(H_m \otimes H_{n-m})$. The spectra of $\Omega_1 = \mathrm{Tr}_{H_{n-m}}(\Omega)$ and

$\Omega_2 = \mathrm{Tr}_{H_m}(\Omega)$ are known to coincide as an immediate consequence of the Schmidt decomposition in tensor product Hilbert space $H_m \otimes H_{n-m}$ (see, e.g., [61]). It follows from the construction that for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_1$ we have

$$\omega_1(x) = \omega(x) = \Omega(UxU^\dagger) = \Omega(x^{(1)} \otimes I) = \Omega_1(x), \quad (8)$$

therefore, ω_1 and Ω_1 have the same spectra.

To prove that spectra of ω_2 and Ω_2 coincide too, we first notice the trivial action of these functionals on odd order monomials, namely, $\omega_2(a^\#_{j_1} \dots a^\#_{j_{2k+1}}) = \omega(a^\#_{j_1} \dots a^\#_{j_{2k+1}}) = 0$ because ω is even state in virtue of Proposition 1. On the other hand, for all $m+1 \le j_s \le n$

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_2(a^{(2)\#}_{j_1} \dots a^{(2)\#}_{j_{2k+1}}) &= \Omega(I \otimes a^{(2)\#}_{j_1} \dots a^{(2)\#}_{j_{2k+1}}) \\ &= \omega\left(\prod_{s=1}^{m}(a_s a_s^\dagger - a_s^\dagger a_s) a^\#_{j_1} \dots a^\#_{j_{2k+1}}\right) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

because ω is even. Thus, both ω_2 and Ω_2 vanish on odd monomials. As far as even monomials are concerned,

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(a^\#_{j_1} \dots a^\#_{j_{2k}}) &= \Omega(U a^\#_{j_1} \dots a^\#_{j_{2k}} U^\dagger) \\ &= \Omega(\Gamma^{2k} \otimes a^{(2)\#}_{j_1} \dots a^{(2)\#}_{j_{2k}}) = \Omega_2(a^{(2)\#}_{j_1} \dots a^{(2)\#}_{j_{2k}}) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

because $\Gamma^{2k} = I$. Thus, ω_2 and Ω_2 coincide on even monomials too. To conclude, $\mathrm{Spect}(\omega_1) = \mathrm{Spect}(\Omega_1) = \mathrm{Spect}(\Omega_2) = \mathrm{Spect}(\omega_2)$. □

The obtained result shows that states satisfying the parity superselection rule have equispectral reduced states and, therefore, are physical. Note that superselected states do not necessary have a fixed number of particles, and we believe that coherent superposition (not mixtures) of different number of fermionic quasiparticles can be observed in future experiments [20–22]. From a mathematical viewpoint, it is interesting to find all possible states with equispectral reduced states. The answer to this question provides the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that for a pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ the partial states ω_1 and ω_2 have identical spectra. Then, there exist a state $|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ satisfying the parity superselection rule and unitary operators $U_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $U_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$ such that the partial states of $|U_2U_1\phi\rangle\langle U_2U_1\phi|$ coincide with ω_i, $i = 1, 2$. If the spectra of ω_i are simple (nondegenerate), then $|\psi\rangle = U_1U_2|\phi\rangle$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality it can be assumed that bipartition of n fermionic modes into m and $n-m$ modes is such that $n - m \le m$ (otherwise the modes can be relabelled).

Consider the state ω_2. In the Hilbert space H_{n-m} choose the orthonormal basis $\{|e_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n}\rangle\}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_2$

$$\omega_2(x) = \sum_{j_s,\, m+1 \le s \le n} \lambda_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n} \langle e_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n}|x|e_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n}\rangle.$$

Pick the unitary operator $U_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$ such that

$$U_2|j_{m+1}\dots j_n\rangle = e_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n}, \quad j_s \in \{0,1\},\ m+1 \le s \le n.$$

Consider the pure state $\tilde\omega(x) = \omega(U_2 x U_2^\dagger)$, $x \in \mathcal{A}$. Then for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_2$ we have

$$\tilde\omega_2(x) = \sum_{j_s,\, m+1 \le s \le n} \lambda_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n} \langle j_{m+1}\dots j_n|x|j_{m+1}\dots j_n\rangle. \quad (11)$$

Since ω_1 and ω_2 are equispectral by the statement of Theorem, the states $\tilde\omega_1$ and $\tilde\omega_2$ are equispectral too due to the local action of U_2. Consequently, there exists the orthonormal basis $\{|f_t\rangle\}_{t=0}^{2^{n-m}-1} \cup \{|g_t\rangle\}_{t=2^{n-m}}^{2^m-1}$ in H_m such that for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_1$

$$\tilde\omega_1(x) = \sum_{t=0}^{2^{n-m}-1} \lambda_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n = \mathrm{bin}(t)} \langle f_t|x|f_t\rangle, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathrm{bin}(t)$ is the binary representation of t. Pick the unitary operator $U_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 |\, \underbrace{0\dots0}_{\substack{2m-n\\ \text{bits}}}\, \underbrace{\mathrm{bin}(t)}_{\substack{n-m\\ \text{bits}}}\rangle &= |f_t\rangle, \quad t = 0, \dots, 2^{n-m}-1, \\ U_1 |\, \underbrace{\mathrm{bin}(t)}_{\substack{m\\ \text{bits}}}\rangle &= |g_t\rangle, \quad t = 2^{n-m}, \dots, 2^m - 1. \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to see that a vector

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{t=0}^{2^{n-m}-1} \sqrt{\lambda_{j_{m+1}\dots j_n = \mathrm{bin}(t)}}\, |\, \underbrace{0\dots0}_{\substack{2m-n\\ \text{bits}}}\, \underbrace{\mathrm{bin}(t)}_{\substack{n-m\\ \text{bits}}}\, \underbrace{\mathrm{bin}(t)}_{\substack{n-m\\ \text{bits}}}\rangle$$

generates the state $\Omega(x) = \langle\phi|x|\phi\rangle$, $x \in \mathcal{A}$, which satisfies the parity superselection rule as the number of quasiparticles in t-th summand equals an even number $2 \times$ (# of 1's in bin(t)). Moreover, Ω has $\tilde\omega_2$ and $\tilde{\tilde\omega}_1(x) = \tilde\omega_1(U_1 x U_1^\dagger)$ as its partial states. In other words, reduced states of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and reduced states of $|U_2U_1\phi\rangle\langle U_2U_1\phi|$ coincide.

Now suppose that the coincident spectra of ω_i, $i = 1, 2$ are simple (nondegenerate). Take the unitary operators U and Γ determined in Eq. (6) and consider the state $\tilde\Omega(X) = \Omega(U^\dagger X U)$, $X \in \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$. According to Eq. (8), for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_1$ we have $\tilde\Omega_1(x) = \tilde{\tilde\omega}_1(x)$. Analogously, since Ω is even, from Eqs. (9)–(10) it follows that for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_2$ the relation $\tilde\Omega_2(x) = \tilde\omega_2(x)$ holds.

On the other hand, as the spectrum of Ω_i is simple there exists the only state on $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$ (namely, $\tilde\Omega$) such that its partial traces coincide with Ω_1 and Ω_2 (see, e.g., [61]). Hence, the same uniqueness holds for the state on $\mathcal{A}$ (namely, Ω). Thus, there is the only possibility to reconstruct the entire state from its partial states. It implies that $\omega(x) = \Omega(U_1^\dagger U_2^\dagger x U_2 U_1)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$. □

Theorem 2 characterized possible states with equispectral reduced states. Such states do not have to satisfy the parity superselection rule (cf. Proposition 3) but they are obtained from the superselected states by unitary operators acting on corresponding parties of the bipartite state.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Recent experiments with massless fermionic quasiparticles motivated us to study states that are in pure superposition of different number states. Treating states with non-coincident spectra of partial states as unphysical, we have characterized the class of physical states and demonstrated its relation with states satisfying the parity superselection rule. The results of Proposition 3 and Theorem 2 can also be interpreted as the construction of valid purifications for fermionic density operators. Such states may violate the parity superselection rule in some fixed basis but remain physical.

As a byproduct of our research, we have analyzed the density matrix formalism for general case of fermionic states. The developed formalism clearly indicates that the conventional partial trace methods are not applicable to fermionic states.

Acknowledgments

The authors are delighted to thank A.S. Holevo for a motivation of this work and illuminating discussions. Propositions 1 and 2, Corollary 1, Theorems 1 and 2 are proved by G.G. Amosov. Sections I and V, Corollary 2, Proposition 3, Examples 1 and 2 are due to S.N. Filippov. Both authors discussed the results and commented on the manuscript. The work of G.G. Amosov is supported by Russian Science Foundation under grant No. 14-21-00162 and performed in Steklov Mathematical Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences. S.N. Filippov acknowledges support from the Russian Foundation for Basic Research under Project Nos. 14-07-00937-a and 16-37-60070 mol_a_dk and support from the Council for Grants of the President of the Russian Federation under Project No. SP-2536.2015.5.

[1] R. Landauer, Phys. Lett. A **217**, 188 (1996).
[2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[3] W. Pauli, Zeitschrift für Physik **31**, 373 (1925).
[4] G. E. Uhlenbeck, S. Goudsmit. Die Naturwissenschaften **13**, 953 (1925).
[5] W. Pauli, Zeitschrift für Physik **31**, 765 (1925).
[6] E. Fermi, Zeitschrift für Physik **36**, 902 (1926).
[7] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Royal Soc. A **112**, 661 (1926).
[8] P. Jordan and E. P. Wigner, Zeitschrift für Physik **47**, 631 (1928).
[9] V. Fock, Zeitschrift für Physik **75**, 622 (1932).
[10] M. Fierz, Helvetica Physica Acta **12**, 3 (1939).
[11] W. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **58**, 716 (1940).
[12] G. C. Wick, A. S. Wightman, and E. P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **88**, 101 (1952).
[13] A. S. Wightman, Il Nuovo Cimento B **110**, 751 (1995).
[14] C. Cisneros, R. P. Martínez-y-Romero, H. N. Núñez-Yépez, and A. L. Salas-Brito, Eur. J. Phys. **19**, 237 (1998).
[15] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, R. W. Spekkens, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 555 (2007).
[16] G. C. Hegerfeldt, K. Kraus, and E. P. Wigner, J. Math. Phys. **9**, 2029 (1968).
[17] V. Bargman, Ann. Math. **59**, 1 (1954).
[18] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia and M. Maltoni, Phys. Rep. **460**, 1 (2008).
[19] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP **26**, 984 (1968).
[20] S.-Y. Xu et al, Science **349**, 613 (2015).
[21] L. Lu et al, Science **349**, 622 (2015).
[22] S.-Y. Xu et al, Nature Physics **11**, 748 (2015).
[23] H. Moriya, Lett. Math. Phys. **60**, 109 (2002).
[24] H. Araki and E. H. Lieb, Commun. Math. Phys. **18**, 160 (1970).
[25] N. Friis, A. R. Lee, and D. E. Bruschi, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 022338 (2013).
[26] N. Friis, arXiv:1502.04476v1 [quant-ph].
[27] M. Montero and E. Martín-Martínez, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 062323 (2011).
[28] K. Brádler and R. Jáuregui, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 016301 (2012).
[29] M. Montero and E. Martín-Martínez, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 016302 (2012).
[30] K. E. Cahill and R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1538 (1999).
[31] B. C. Carlson and J. M. Keller, Phys. Rev. **121**, 659 (1961).
[32] A. J. Coleman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **35**, 668 (1963).
[33] T. Ando, Rev. Mod. Phys. **35**, 690 (1963).
[34] D. A. Mazziotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 263002 (2012).
[35] R. E. Borland and K. Dennis, J. Phys. B **5**, 7 (1972).
[36] C. Schilling, D. Gross, M. Christandl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 040404 (2013).
[37] C. L. Benavides-Riveros and M. Springborg, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012512 (2015).
[38] C. Schilling, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 155149 (2015).
[39] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042101 (2002).
[40] G. G. Amosov and S. Mancini, AIP Conf. Proc. **1101**, 100 (2009).
[41] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, and K. Titimbo, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **21**, 1440003 (2014).
[42] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, and U. Marzolino, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 032326 (2014).
[43] U. Marzolino and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 032316 (2015).
[44] H.M. Wiseman, J.A. Vaccaro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 097902 (2003).
[45] Y. Shi, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 024301 (2003).
[46] M.-C. Bañuls, J. I. Cirac, and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 022311 (2007).
[47] N. Gigena and R. Rossignoli, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 042326 (2015).
[48] S. Bravyi, arxiv: quant-ph//0507282.
[49] M. Fannes, N. Van Ryn, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45**, 385003 (2012).
[50] A. Sen(De), U. Sen, B. Gromek, D. Bruß, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 260503 (2005).
[51] G. M. D'Ariano, F. Manessi, P. Perinotti, and A. Tosini, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **29**, 1430025 (2014).
[52] Z. Zimborás, R. Zeier, M. Keyl, and T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, EPJ Quantum Technology **1**, 11 (2014).
[53] G. M. D'Ariano, F. Manessi, P. Perinotti, and A. Tosini, EPL **107**, 20009 (2014).
[54] S. B. Bravyi and A. Yu. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **298**, 210 (2002).
[55] F. A. Berezin, *The Method of Second Quantization* (Academic Press, New York, 1966).
[56] D. E. Evans, Commun. Math. Phys. **70**, 53 (1979).
[57] B. Dierckx, M. Fannes, and M. Pogorzelska, J. Math. Phys. **49**, 032109 (2008).

[58] H. Araki, W. Wyss, Helvetica Physica Acta **37**, 136 (1964).
[59] S. Bravyi, Quantum Inf. Comput. **5**, 216 (2005).
[60] E. Greplova, Master thesis, University of Munich, 2013.
[61] A. S. Holevo, *Quantum Systems, Channels, Information* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2012), Section 3.1.3.